

Are Catholics Intolerant?

By PETER FINLAY, S.J.

BY intolerance I understand, in this discussion, an attitude of mind. I know the word is often taken to mean a course of external action directed to repress or punish acts or opinions which we regard as evil or untrue. But I do not use the word in that sense at present. We shall not discuss today the policy of Catholic sovereigns or of Popes in warring upon religious views and practices of which they disapproved. We limit ourselves to the intellectual position of the Catholic Church and of Catholics, when they look out on other churches and other forms of religious belief, and pass judgment upon them. And in this limited sense we are not concerned with any of the facts of history. We need not inquire if Catholics have sometimes fallen short of the obligation which loyalty to their Faith imposes on them, or at other times have gone beyond those obligations. We have only to determine what these obligations are, what the judgment is which Catholics are compelled by their religion itself to form of every other religious system and of every Christian organization which is separated from their own.

The charge against us is that we are intolerant, that we condemn every other Christian church and sect as false, that we put ourselves forward as a chosen people, that we claim a monopoly of revealed truth and of the Divinely appointed means of salvation. And our mental

bearing toward other churches and religions is one of hostility. We may not perhaps translate it into words, we may not follow it up by action; but we are opposed in principle to all other churches. We cannot be content to live and let live. We would, if we might, impose our own religious views upon the whole Christian world. Such is the charge which is brought against us; and we may say at once that in the main, it is well founded. We shall not attempt to deny but to justify the charge.

Intolerance, then, is a want of patience with evil. We tolerate what is in some way a menace or an injury to ourselves. We do not tolerate what is in itself simply good, or what, while evil, has no relation to us. We do not tolerate happiness or success; we do not tolerate the misfortunes and sufferings of another, unless in a sense they become our own through our connection with him. Toleration is the disposition of mind, or is the act of will, by which we resign ourselves to the presence and the influence of what is evil, while we recognize its true nature and hurtfulness. To be tolerant of error a man must know the truth; and he must set little importance upon it, or he must attach little consequence to the error, or he must hold the foolish theory that contradictories may be equally true. It is impossible to tolerate an error, if I know it to be such, if it affects myself or someone or something I hold dear, and if I realize the greatness of the injury it threatens or is doing. I do not tolerate—I am speaking always of my mind and will—I do not tolerate unfavorable or grave aspersions on the character of relatives or of friends, when I know them to be false. I reprobate them, I detest them, I would refute and crush them, if I might. And no one, I think, will say that my intolerance is to be condemned.

Now, apply this to matters of religion. A man may be tolerant of religious errors, if he have no certain knowledge of religious truth; or if he set no great value either for himself or others on the religion he professes; or if he hold that errors in religion are unimportant. But, if he be convinced that his own religion, and it alone, is true; that it is revealed of God; that God has appointed it the ordinary means by which men are to be sanctified and saved; that it is embodied in a Church which God has Himself established; that the very existence of heresy and schism is a frustration of God's plan, a rejection of His authority, a danger and an injury to men; if he see all this, how can he be tolerant of a false religion? Surely he must condemn it, detest it, desire to abolish it if he may. And this is religious intolerance.

Hence the Catholic Church and Catholics are religiously intolerant. They have no choice. One religion is not as good and as true as another: the Catholic religion alone is true for God has revealed that religion and that only. The Catholic Church alone was established by God. Every other religion and every other church is false. They are works of merely human invention. If there be an appearance of arrogance and self-glorification in such statements, the responsibility is not ours: we do nothing more than acknowledge and assert what God Himself has appointed and declared to us.

For it cannot be a matter of indifference to us Catholics, nor indeed to any religiously minded person, whether God's claims are submitted to or not. If we feel rightly about God and His place in His own universe, we must desire to see His will fulfilled and must be grieved at the failure of His designs; we must be indignant with those who wilfully oppose them; we must be

eager to help as far as we may in realizing them. And God wishes all men to receive in full the Revelation He has made; and He wills all men to be saved through membership of the Church He has established; and there is only one perfect Revelation and one Divinely established Church, and we are members of it. How, then, can we regard with satisfaction or even indifference, how can we be tolerant of, a mutilated revelation or a man-made church? Surely, if we are in earnest about religion, we shall be eager to win over the adherents of such false systems to the truth.

And when we consider, further, the spiritual hurt that heresy and schism inflict on their adherents, the errors in which they hold them, the graces of which they deprive them, the dangers to which they expose them, how can we be coldly indifferent to the interests of souls and not long and pray rather that God may bring them into His own Kingdom?

Then, again, every Catholic, when he recites the Apostles' Creed, and says: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," professes as an article of his Faith, the falsity of all separated churches. He cannot declare his belief that his Church, the Roman Church, is the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, without declaring at the same time that all other churches are untrue and counterfeit. Fragments of the truth, he knows, may be in all of them; but not the whole in any. They may not, he confesses, be entirely without means of grace; but they cannot have such means in all their fulness. He cannot even deliberately doubt that God reprobates and detests them. And, knowing this, is he himself, in mind and judgment, to tolerate them?

Besides, the true Church of Christ, the Catholic

Church, was Divinely established to guard and teach revealed truth, to preserve and minister the means of grace and of salvation. She cannot guard and teach the truth without condemning error; she cannot invite to a worthy use of Sacraments and Sacrifice without condemning all other rites and forms of worship. And this, again, is to be intolerant.

Finally, the Church has been appointed to "preach the Gospel to every creature," and to draw all men to her own bosom. She is to press the full measure of God's Revelation upon all men's acceptance; she is to baptize all men into the full privileges of Christ's Kingdom; and if she looks tolerantly on other religions and on other churches, how can she be faithful to her Divine mission? She may not tolerate heathenism, she may not tolerate infidelity; for she was established to combat both and to overcome them. And so she may not tolerate heresy and schism, which are only less untrue, for she was established to combat all religious error. Indeed, the missionary zeal and labors of the Church are proof of her constitutional intolerance; for as the missionary spirit is called forth by Christ's command, "Go, therefore, preach to every creature," not merely to the heathen and the infidel but to every class of unbelievers, it follows that in the Church's mission Christ laid upon her a precept of intolerance. She is intolerant, because the very purpose of her being is to spread and defend religious truth, and because every form of religious error is, consequently, her enemy.

When opponents, therefore, challenge us, and ask if we allow the accusation of intolerance, of intolerance as an attitude of judgment and of will, we answer, first, that such intolerance is not an argument against our

Church and Faith. There is no shadow of opposition between intolerance and truth. And then we shall go on to add that the true Church, and indeed any church which believes in itself as true, must necessarily be intolerant. For truth is always intolerant of falsehood, more particularly where all-important interests are involved. And God's interests and the most vital interests of souls are involved in this question of true and false religions. The Catholic Church, moreover, has a Divine commission and command to preach the Catholic Faith to every creature, to watch over and defend it, to guard it against all attacks which may be made upon it. How can it be anything but intolerant of religious error? So far, indeed, from intolerance affording any objection to the Catholic Church, we may say that it is one of the most marked and essential characteristics of the Church of Christ.

And hence the celebrated doctrine, on which so much controversy has turned, and which is so often quoted as the *reductio ad absurdum* of Catholic intolerance: "Outside the Church there is no salvation." It is the logical outcome of our views upon intolerance, and is at the same time their fullest justification. We proceed, then, to determine the meaning of the phrase and to prove its accuracy.

The idea of it which is generally entertained among non-Catholics is that we regard as certain to be excluded from eternal happiness all who die outside the communion of the visible Church. No matter how estimable their lives may have been, no matter what virtues they may have practised, no matter how faithfully they may have followed conscience in life and in death, if they are not in external union with the Catholic Church when the end

comes, conscience has been a useless guide, their virtues have been practised in vain; they shall never see God in heaven. And you may meet some Catholics at times who share in the idea. Now we may say at once that the Catholic Church neither teaches nor holds any such doctrine. Her belief upon the subject is expressed clearly and briefly by Pope Pius IX, in one of his earlier Allocutions: "We must hold it to be of Faith," he says, "that, outside the Apostolic Roman Church, there is no salvation, that this Church is the one ark of safety, that those who will not enter shall perish in the deluge. But it is also to be held as certain that those to whom the true religion is unknown, if their ignorance be invincible, are so far guiltless in the eyes of God. And who shall dare to say where ignorance begins or ends in such vast variety of race, of country, of mental gifts, and of other circumstances?" And Pope Pius only proclaims and emphasizes what is, and has ever been, the received teaching of Catholic theology: "Outside the Church there is no salvation"; yet God's mercy knows no limits. "Who are we," as the Pope adds, "that we should attempt to search into His secret counsels or His Divine judgments, which are, as it were, a vast abyss that man's thought cannot see into?" But how are we to reconcile what must still appear to be contradictory statements?

We begin, then, by supposing that one may belong to the Catholic Church, yet not be in visible communion with her. There is only one Baptism, and that Baptism in Christ's design is the doorway into the one true Church; and those who validly receive it are thereby made members of the Church, unless they shut themselves out voluntarily from her. Little children, when validly baptized in heresy, are baptized into the Church, not into

the heretical body to which they nominally belong, but into the Church of Christ, the one holy, Catholic Church. And God's graces are poured out upon the child's soul; it becomes the friend of God and the heir to His heavenly Kingdom. These graces, this friendship, this right to heaven, it can never lose unless by mortal sin; if lost, it may regain them by perfect contrition or by perfect charity. If it die in childhood it enters heaven, as of right. If in adult years, and without having fallen into grievous sin, its right remains, and heaven is its portion. If it sin, but rise again through love or sorrow, its rights and privileges are restored; and, if the end find it in God's grace, its eternal happiness is assured. And all this is true of every soul that by whatever means, by Baptism of water, or Baptism of desire, or Baptism of blood, finds grace and favor before God, and dies in His grace and favor. Death in God's grace is a certain passport to a blessed eternity. How far such conditions are likely to be verified outside the Church, how often they are verified, who shall say? Holy Scripture is almost silent about those to whom Christ's Gospel has not been preached, to whom the Church's claims have never been brought home. This silence is not in itself, indeed, a ground of confidence. But it forbids at least all presumptuous human judgments; and it turns our thoughts toward the providential ways of an all-wise and an infinitely merciful God. It permits us to regard many of those outside the visible Church as acting under the influence of grace, and so living here as to merit life everlasting. It allows us to apply to them, in their fulness, the Gospel promises: that the pure of heart shall see God; that whosoever leaveth house and friends, father and mother, wife and children, for Christ's sake, shall receive

a hundredfold here and life eternal; that he who abideth in charity abideth in God, and God will raise him up at the last day; and others of a similarly consoling character. And, surely, when we look around us, and consider the high example of many Christian virtues to be seen outside the Church—the purity of heart, the love of God, the zeal for the Divine honor, the charity toward God's poor, the meekness, the kindliness, the self-denial, the generous self-sacrifice—may we not hope that such souls are of those "other sheep" of whom Our Blessed Lord spoke to His Apostles, and whom He will gather visibly into His sheepfold, at the latest, upon the great accounting day? Or may we not say that they already belong, all unwittingly, to the true Church of Christ, even while they conscientiously and, therefore, sinlessly reject her claims? Perhaps they were validly baptized, or they may have turned to God in faith and charity in adult years, and they are closely united with Him now by an abundance of supernatural gifts. They have never wilfully rejected the light which was given to them. They may be prepared and resolved to do God's will whensoever and in whatsoever things it shall be made known to them. And if they apparently pass away in these dispositions, who are we that we should venture to form an unfavorable judgment on them? "Who art thou," St. Paul writes to the Romans, "who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own Lord he standeth or falleth. And he shall stand, for the Lord hath power to make him stand."

But while we gladly abstain from all judgment upon individual souls who live and die outside the Church's pale, while we commit them to God's infinite mercies in the confident assurance that, dying pure from sin, they

shall live with Him throughout eternity; and while we admit and hope that there may be many outside the Church who have never heard or never recognized the Divine call to membership, and have, therefore, never sinned against their resultant obligations, we shall not be disposed to think lightly of their peril. "The hand of the Lord is not indeed shortened that it cannot save; neither is his ear heavy that it cannot hear." But there is no gainsaying the dangers in which souls stand, who live or die outside the visible Church of Christ.

It is, of course, an inestimable blessing to be a member of the visible Church. Membership enables us to know with unerring certainty the Revelation which Christ made, to share in the graces of the full sacramental system which He instituted, to live under the authoritative guidance of the rulers whom He appointed. These in themselves are very excellent privileges, and they are fountains from which many other and very wondrous favors spring. We have an easy solution to all religious doubts and difficulties; and, so, peace and joy in believing. We have the Communion of Saints, varied practices of piety, the example of the Gospel Counsels, the spirit and exercise of penance, good works of supererogation, devotion to Our Lady, the Daily Sacrifice, frequent Confession and Communion, safeguards against sinning, facilities for repenting. And many or all of these things, and others like them, are wanting to Christian souls, however sincere and earnest they be, without the Church. Now, remember that salvation is conditioned by the possession of God's sanctifying grace; to reach heaven we must obtain that grace, we must preserve it, if lost we must regain it before we die. And then consider the comparative state of Catholics and non-Catholics in all

these respects. We have just seen what our privileges are. But many non-Catholics never receive Baptism at all, or are invalidly baptized; they are cut off from God's sanctifying grace in childhood and in early youth; they may easily fail throughout the whole of life of gaining it at all. And, suppose them to have secured possession of it, their hold upon it is far more frail than ours. They have the same passions, the same temptations, the same human weaknesses that we have; but they have not generally the same religious and moral training; they have not Confession and Communion from earliest years; they have not our exercises of devotion, love of Our Lady and of the Saints, confraternities, sodalities, retreats, the hundred-and-one details of Catholic life, which help so powerfully to preserve our souls in grace. And, if they fall, they find it much more difficult to rise. They are ignorant often that they must repent of sin, that a mere avoidance of relapse is not sufficient to obtain forgiveness. If they even know that repentance is required, they may not know, they frequently do not know, how repentance should be wrought. They have no Sacrament of Penance, in which less perfect motives will suffice. They must obtain pardon by perfect sorrow or by perfect love. And perfect sorrow and perfect love are often far from easy, even to souls who have the privileges and helps which we have. No wonder, then, that Pius IX condemned as errors the sixteenth proposition of the Syllabus: "Men can find the way of eternal salvation, and may attain salvation, in the exercise of any religion," and the seventeenth: "At any rate, we may hope greatly for the eternal salvation of all those who live outside the true Church of Christ."

But all this, it must be admitted, falls short of proving

the doctrine of exclusive salvation, the doctrine, that is, that there is no salvation without the true Church. And so we proceed to inquire if membership of the Church is merely a blessing and a privilege, or is it of binding and serious obligation as well.

We assume, then, that the chief purpose of man's life on earth is to prepare for a future state, the state which lies beyond the grave. And it cannot be seriously questioned that man is bound to make that preparation, to take all wise and reasonable precautions for securing a blessed eternity. If self-preservation be not merely an instinct of nature, but a moral law; if men may not misuse grossly, or recklessly cast away, the material and spiritual gifts which God bestows upon them, and which fit them for personal happiness and for social intercourse; surely they are gravely bound to guard against the loss of that higher life, which should follow after death, and against the perversion or destruction of the faculties and gifts, through which alone that higher life is possible. And, surely, too, they are bound to adopt the means, which is at once the easiest and safest to fulfil that obligation. But, as we have seen already, external membership of the Catholic Church offers just such a safe and easy means. Men, therefore, if they would save their souls, would appear bound to enter the Church.

Consider, further, the object of Christ's coming. "God so loved the world," He Himself tells us, "as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but may have life everlasting." And for this Christ spent thirty years of hidden labor, and then three years of a toilsome public ministry, teaching, gathering adherents, training His Apostles, founding and establishing His Church which should perpetuate His Divine

mission, and be His chosen instrument for its accomplishment. And recall to mind the marvelous zeal and labors of the Apostles in building upon the foundations which Christ had laid: the journeyings, the privations, the sufferings, and dangers which they underwent. St. Paul sums it all up in writing to the Corinthians: "I think," he says, "that God hath set forth us Apostles last of all, as it were men doomed to death; for we are made a spectacle to the world, to angels and to men. We are fools for Christ's sake. Even unto this hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and buffeted, and have no fixed abode. We are reviled, we are persecuted. We are made as the refuse of the world, the offscouring of all things, even until now." And "they rejoiced exceedingly that they were accounted worthy to suffer for the name" and for the work of Christ. We find, then, that the earnest and unceasing efforts of Christ and His Apostles were all directed to this one great object, to save men's souls, not as single separate individuals, but as subjects of a world-wide spiritual kingdom, His Church. The whole history, indeed of the New Testament is the history of the foundation and growth of Christ's Church on earth, through which and in which men are to be saved. And are we to believe that Christ and His Apostles were so concerned to found an institution, and to labor so unweariedly to draw men into one, which they held to be a help, indeed, but still a quite unnecessary help toward salvation? May we not even assert unhesitatingly that their words, their works, their whole lives point clearly to the supreme value of Church membership, and imply that any voluntary rejection of it by those to whom it has been offered constitutes an insuperable obstacle to the salvation of their souls?

And again, reflect upon the attitude adopted by the Apostles toward those who had fallen from the Church, through heresy or schism. We are scarcely surprised to find St. Paul advising Titus: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second warning, avoid: knowing that such a one is subverted and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment"; or commanding Timothy to "war the good warfare, having faith and a good conscience, which some, rejecting, have made shipwreck concerning the faith . . . whom I have delivered up to Satan that they may learn not to blaspheme." But even St. John, the Apostle of love and gentleness, is no whit behind St. Paul in his vehement denunciation of religious errors. "Whosoever revolteth," he writes to the Lady Elect and to her children, "and continueth not in the doctrines of Christ hath not God. . . . If any man come unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, nor say to him: God speed you." Tolerance, you see, was no part of the Apostolic temper. And what must we conclude from such stern words and such unsparing judgments, if not that the Apostles and the Apostolic Church esteemed heresy to be a spiritual death, and the heretic to be cut off by his own act, not only from the communion of the Church on earth, but also from the hope of happiness in heaven? And if men may not deny a teaching of the Faith, or resign Church membership, without imperiling salvation, can they, do you think, without incurring similar consequences, reject the Faith, or refuse Church membership, when offered to them?

But we are not left to inferences, however certain. Our Lord, when establishing His Church, was pleased to declare expressly that all men are bound, under the very

gravest penalties, to enter into it. "Going," He tells the Apostles, "preach, saying the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Then, having explained to them the objects and the methods of the Apostleship, He continues: "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, going forth out of that house or city, shake off the dust from your feet. Amen, I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorra in the day of judgment than for that city." Now to hear the words of the Apostles is not to listen only to their preaching. To hear them is to accept their message, and to obey it. To accept it is to believe the doctrines which they teach; to obey it is to seek entrance into the Kingdom which Christ was founding, and which the Apostles were commissioned by Him to announce. And whoever refuses to believe the doctrines and to seek entrance into the Kingdom, challenges, Our Lord tells them, a more intolerable judgment than that of Sodom and Gomorra.

And, later, on the occasion which St. Mark describes in the last chapter of his Gospel, where he tells of Christ's interview with the Apostles, before He was taken up into heaven from them: "Go ye into the whole world," Our Lord says to them, "and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The Saviour lays down distinctly the conditions on which salvation is to be secured: those to whom the Gospel has been preached must accept it in its entirety, and must be initiated by Baptism into the Kingdom, which is Christ's Church. Then, to bring out more emphatically the absolute necessity of fulfilling these conditions, Our Saviour adds: "But he that believeth not shall be condemned." We have it, therefore, on Our Lord's own authority, that unless a man believes Christ's doctrines

and enters into Christ's Church, he shall not escape condemnation. Membership of the Church is, therefore, an essential condition of salvation.

From the nature of the case, then, from the Constitution of the Church, from the history of its foundation by Christ and by the Apostles, and from Our Lord's explicit statements, we gather beyond all doubt or question that "Outside the true Church of Christ there is no salvation."

Indeed, the doctrine lies so clearly on the face of Scripture that the whole Christian world has unhesitatingly accepted it. It is more than insinuated in the primitive Symbols of Faith, beginning with the earliest form of the Apostles' Creed. For why should the Faithful make the habitual profession: "I believe in Holy Church," or "in the Holy Catholic Church," and couple it with the belief in "saving Baptism," unless they believe membership of the Church to be necessary for salvation? And that this was the case is clear from the testimony of the Fathers, whose writings have handed down to us the Faith of the primitive Church. I shall quote three only, who, however, may be taken as speaking for the rest. The first is Origen, who, in one of his homilies, declares: "Let no one persuade himself, let no one deceive himself: without this house, that is, without the Church, no one is saved." St. Cyprian, martyr, composed a treatise on the unity of the Church: "Whosoever," he says, "is separated from the Church is united with an adulteress, and is cut off from the Church's promises. He shall not attain to the rewards of Christ who deserts the Church of Christ. . . . He cannot have God for his Father who has not the Church for his Mother. If any could escape who were outside Noah's Ark, then he also may

be saved who is without the Church." And Augustine, addressing the Faithful of Cæsarea in presence of Emeritus, a Donatist bishop, puts the truth even still more emphatically: "Outside the Catholic Church, he (Emeritus) can have everything except salvation. He can have honors, he can have Sacraments, he may chant Alleluia, he may answer Amen, he may have the Gospel, he may have and may preach the Faith in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but nowhere, except in the Catholic Church, can he find salvation." This, too, is the constant teaching of Councils and of Popes. The Athanasian Creed is not a Conciliar or Papal definition, but it has been accepted by the Universal Church since the sixth century as a standard of belief; and the opening sentence of the Athanasian Creed is: "Whosoever will be saved must, before all things, hold the Catholic Faith, which unless one preserves whole and inviolate he shall perish, without doubt, for ever." And it closes with the sentence: "This is the Catholic Faith, which unless one believe faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved." Somewhat later, Pope Siricius, writing to the schismatical Bishops of Istria, and quoting St. Augustine, asks them: "Does he think he holds the Faith who does not hold this unity of the Church? . . . Those cannot continue with God who have refused to live united in God's Church. Though they should burn in the flames or perish by wild beasts, they shall receive no crown of faith, but the punishment of perfidy . . . such a one may be slain, he cannot be crowned." Later still, the Fourth Council of Lateran defined: "There is but one Universal Church of all the Faithful, without which no one whosoever is saved." And, a very little afterwards, Boniface VIII begins the celebrated Bull *Unam Sanctam*

with the words: "We are compelled by faith to hold and believe one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; and that Church we firmly believe and sincerely confess, outside of which there is neither salvation nor remission of sins." Then the Ecumenical Council of Florence, in its profession of faith, asserts of the true Church of Christ, the Holy Roman Church, that: "It firmly believes, professes, and preaches that none of those without the Church, pagans, Jews, heretics, or schismatics, can become partakers of eternal life . . . and that no one, whatsoever alms he may give, and though he should shed his blood for the name of Christ, can be saved, unless he persevere in the bosom and the unity of the Catholic Church." I pass over solemn declarations, such as the Tridentine profession of faith, and come down almost to our own days, to Pius IX, who formulated and emphasized the doctrine more distinctly than any of his predecessors. "It is to be held as of faith," he says, in words already quoted, "that outside the Apostolic Roman Church no one can be saved. That Church is the one ark of salvation; he who hath not entered her shall perish in the deluge." A few years afterwards, in one of his Encyclicals, he "refers to and condemns the most grave error of some unhappy Catholics, who are of opinion that men living in error, and separated from the Faith and from Catholic unity, can yet attain to life eternal. Than which nothing," he adds, "could be more opposed to Catholic doctrine."

But I need quote no more. It is, I think, clear, from what we have already seen, that no dogma of our Faith is more firmly established in the Holy Scriptures, more plainly set forth by the Fathers of both East and West, more distinctly defined and taught by Popes and Coun-

cils, than this doctrine of exclusive salvation, or the doctrine that "there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church." It does not imply, we have already shown it does not, that all must perish who die outside the Church's visible communion. We dare set no limits, except what He Himself reveals, to God's omnipotent mercy in His dealings with infidels, with schismatics and heretics. But He has Himself revealed that men are bound to enter into His Church, when its Divine claims are brought home to them. All men are bound to embrace the religion which God has revealed, and to enter into the society or Church which God has founded, provided the obligation is made known to them. To do otherwise is to rebel against God: it is to refuse obedience to His statements or obedience to His commands. And such rebellion, if wilfully persisted in, must necessarily exclude from heaven. This, then, is the first and simplest interpretation of the saying that "Outside the Church there is no salvation": there is no salvation, that is, for those outside the Church who recognize her claims and refuse to follow conscience in submitting to them. What God's Providence is with infidels and heretics, who live and die inculpably outside the Church, we are not seeking to determine. We pray and hope. If they die in sanctifying grace, they are certain of salvation: they are of "the soul of the Church," as a received phrase has it, invisibly members of the visible organization. But we are never without grave anxiety. The language of the Bible, of the Fathers, and of the Councils is not to be satisfactorily met by the explanation that those who sin grievously in rejecting the Divine call to a visible Church and visible religion, and those only, are to be shut out from heaven. Those who, even inculpably, are without

the visible Church run also gravest danger. Even when most favorably circumstanced, they secure God's graces less readily, possess them more sparingly, retain them less easily, regain them less certainly and more laboriously, run far greater risk of losing them finally, than if they had the Faith and Sacraments and authoritative guidance of the visible Church of Christ. For them, too, membership of the visible Church may well seem so desirable as to appear almost necessary.

We Catholics are, then, religiously intolerant. We hold as of Divine faith the doctrine that "Outside the Church there is no salvation." But the intolerance and the doctrine are to be understood as we have just explained them.

Hemolysis and Man's Descent

BY RICHARD H. TIERNEY, S.J.

To the Editor of "America":

May I intrude on your space to ask one question about the missing link? It seems to be certain that human blood contains chemico-physiological properties identical in kind with properties found in the blood of apes. Does this not prove that there is a direct genetic relation between man and the ape?

JAMES FOSTER.

Such a fact, were it proved, would by no means establish a genetic relation between man and the ape. Sameness of blood does not imply sameness of origin. The two are quite distinct. The former does not necessarily lead to the latter. Similarity of blood can as easily arise from the intention and action of the Creator as from direct descent. Hence the argument based on such a similarity is entirely ineffective. It leaves the *special creation* of man not only unshaken but untouched. This answer covers the proposed question.

However, there are some further items worthy of consideration. No doubt our correspondent has in mind Friedenthal's experiments. This scientist thought to establish man's origin from the ape by blood relationship. His conclusion is based on hemolysis. Inclusive of all important inferences, the argument would run as follows: Blood does not destroy the red corpuscles of similar blood, but does destroy them in dissimilar blood. Now human blood destroys the red corpuscles of the blood of lower apes but leaves untouched corresponding discs in the blood of higher apes. Hence the blood of man and of the higher ape is similar. This proves a genetic relationship. Man is a descendant of the aforesaid ape. The

argument is faulty in fact and inference. Friedenthal admits that hemolysis depends in some measure on conditions which have absolutely nothing to do with genetic relationship. Thus he refutes his inference. Secondly, his experiments are too incomplete and inconclusive to warrant finality of conclusions. The results obtained are by no means uniform. For instance, sometimes the serum of the blood of lower apes destroys the red corpuscles in human blood; sometimes it does not destroy them.

Logically this places the evolutionist in a quandary. For if hemolysis is to serve as the basis of an argument, the fact just mentioned leads to contradictory conclusions, to wit: man does and does not descend directly from *lower apes*. This completely upsets Friedenthal's hypothesis, especially since he argues that man is a direct descendant not of *lower apes* but of the *anthropoid* ape. We regret that we cannot help the evolutionist to a solution of either difficulty. Logic and cold facts are victorious. Moreover, Nuttall's experiments give rise to further objection against the argument from hemolysis. This difficulty is as serious as any yet considered. He experimented extensively with anti-serum, a substance which affects only similar kinds of blood. The result of the experiments showed that man had blood similar to *eighteen different* kinds of apes. What is the conclusion? We draw none. Friedenthal, however, should conclude that man descended from *eighteen different kinds* of apes. This contradicts his statement that man is the descendant of *one* kind of ape, namely, the anthropoid. Everybody should rejoice in such a contradiction. No one can possibly live up to the reputation of so many varieties of great-great-great-grandfathers of varying degrees of

culture. Happy for all of us that such forbears lie beyond the region of fact in the fertile imagination of some *soi-disant* scientists. Our discussion does not rest here. Experiments with anti-ox-serum has proven that the blood of the ox is similar to the blood of sheep, goats and antelopes. These creatures are not systematically related. They should be, however, if Friedenthal's argument is worth anything. Obviously, it is worth nothing. The strangest, most amusing and most telling fact of all is that the blood of the crab, lug-worm and rat are alike. At least the blood of the first two does not destroy the red discs in the blood of the last named. From this Friedenthal must conclude that the rat is the child of crab and lug-worm.

There is no escape from this reasoning, as will be seen if the argument is thrown into a syllogism. A higher animal whose blood is similar in chemico-physiological properties to the blood of lower animals is a direct descendant of the aforesaid lower animals. But the rat is a higher animal than crab and lug-worm and its blood is similar in chemico-physiological properties to their blood. Therefore, the rat is a direct descendant of crab and lug-worm. *Risum teneatis, amici?* I cannot; for never was there a more fantastic absurdity. Yet it is equally absurd to insist that man is a direct descendant of the ape, because of chemico-physiological properties of the blood. Careful scientists admit as much. Some few years ago Dr. Baden, a specialist in physiological chemistry, gave this problem prolonged and serious attention. His conviction is that this "blood relationship" argument is worthless. In a paper read before the Görres Society, he bluntly told his audience that if they wished to insist on such a method of proof, they should

also argue from similarity of urine to sameness of origin. The absurdity was too great for the equilibrium of the scientists present. Rössle, though more careful in the choice of examples, is no less successful in showing the hollowness of Friedenthal's hypothesis. Justice to the last-named scientist compels us to say that he has protested against the use of his name in connection with the argument commonly attributed to him. In 1907 he declared that he never intended to establish actual kinship from the sameness of blood. His protestations came too late. In 1902 he used language which conveyed the very contradictory to intelligent students. Evidently he has little faith in his hypothesis. Why should others place great faith in it?

For the rest, two things remain unsaid. First, even though all the indirect evidence for evolution be taken into account, it is inaccurate to speak of the *theory* of descent. There is no theory of descent, but only a *hypothesis* about descent. There is a vast difference between the two. Lastly, it seems well to insist once again that the problem of evolution does not revolve entirely around biology, physiology, morphology, and so on. The question is mainly metaphysical and moral. Men without a moral law engraved on their very hearts are inconceivable. But moral law is not and cannot be a product of materialistic evolution. Those who preach that it is, are violating the dominant instinct of their own nature and helping to turn the world into a den of lawless animals, the more dangerous because they are intellectual.